

Remarks

The examiner has noted that the application was not submitted in the preferred layout for a utility application. Applicant is submitting herewith a substitute specification and abstract in the proper format. No new matter has been added.

The examiner has objected to claims 31 and 39 due to the fact that claim 31 had an incorrect reference numeral and that claim 39 referred to claims 1-48 rather than 1-38. The claims have now been amended accordingly.

The examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as failing to show “the spring” “the converter module and/or the first drive module are/is arranged essentially coaxial to the input interface” and the second drive module is arranged essentially coaxial to the output interface”. Claims 15 and 35-36 have now been cancelled.

The examiner has rejected claims 1-51 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. More particularly, the examiner notes that the claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform to current US practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors. The claims have now been amended accordingly.

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements. More particularly, the term “reversibly” is not clear. Claim 1 has now been amended.

The examiner has rejected claims 1-15 as being anticipated by US Published Patent Application 2002/0109357 to Lilley et al. Further the examiner has rejected claims 16-51 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lilley in view of US Published Patent Application 2002/0082134 to Hirt et al. It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 distinguishes over Lilley. More particularly claim 1 requires a drive

system for a vehicle, with a first and a second drive module wherein the drive modules are controlled with at least one controller, such that the drive modules output a given power continuously and independently of each other. In Lilley the drive modules cannot be controlled independently of one another. To the contrary, Lilley in paragraph 0029 states that more than one power source (drive module) can be employed only if the power sources are matched such that the output speeds are synchronous. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 1 of the present application is patentable over Lilley.

In conclusion, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Any fees or charges due as a result of filing of the present paper may be charged against Deposit Account 04-0525.

Respectfully,

/W. Michael Dixon, Reg. #37815/

Attorney for Applicant(s)

W. Michael Dixon  
Reg. No. 37,815  
Global Intellectual Property Services  
Deere & Company  
One John Deere Place  
Moline, IL 61265  
Telephone No. (309) 765-5159